


03-20-2002

JC05 Rec'd PCTO 18 MAR 2002

FORM PTO-1390 (REV. 11-2000) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE <b>TRANSMITTAL LETTER TO THE UNITED STATES DESIGNATED/ELECTED OFFICE (DO/EO/US) CONCERNING A FILING UNDER 35 U.S.C. 371</b>		ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NUMBER  <b>US57.0359-WO</b> U.S. APPLICATION NO. (If known, see 37 CFR 1.5) <b>10/088725</b>
INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION NO. <b>PCT/GB00/03704</b>	INTERNATIONAL FILING DATE <b>27 September 2000 (27.09.00)</b>	PRIORITY DATE CLAIMED <b>01 October 1999 (01.10.99)</b>
TITLE OF INVENTION <b>METHOD FOR UPDATING AN EARTH MODEL USING MEASUREMENTS GATHERED DURING BOREHOLE CONSTRUCTION</b>		
APPLICANT(S) FOR DO/EO/US <b>SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION</b>		
Applicant herewith submits to the United States Designated/Elected Office (DO/EO/US) the following items and other information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This is a <b>FIRST</b> submission of items concerning a filing under 35 U.S.C. 371.</li> <li>2. <input type="checkbox"/> This is a <b>SECOND</b> or <b>SUBSEQUENT</b> submission of items concerning a filing under 35 U.S.C. 371.</li> <li>3. <input type="checkbox"/> This is an express request to begin national examination procedures (35 U.S.C. 371(f)). The submission must include items (5), (6), (9) and (21) indicated below.</li> <li>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The US has been elected by the expiration of 19 months from the priority date (Article 31).</li> <li>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A copy of the International application as filed (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(2))             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <input type="checkbox"/> is attached hereto (required only if not communicated by the International Bureau)</li> <li>b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> has been communicated by the International Bureau.</li> <li>c. <input type="checkbox"/> is not required, as the application was filed in the United States Receiving Office (RO/US).</li> </ol> </li> <li>6. <input type="checkbox"/> An English language translation of the International Application as filed (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(2)).             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <input type="checkbox"/> is attached hereto.</li> <li>b. <input type="checkbox"/> has been previously submitted under 35 U.S.C. 154(d)(4).</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendments to the claims of the International Application under PCT Article 19 (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(3)).             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <input type="checkbox"/> are attached hereto (required only if not communicated by the International Bureau).</li> <li>b. <input type="checkbox"/> have been communicated by the International Bureau.</li> <li>c. <input type="checkbox"/> have not been made; however, the time limit for making such amendments has NOT expired.</li> <li>d. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> have not been made and will not be made.</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. <input type="checkbox"/> An English language translation of the amendments to the claims under PCT Article 19 (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(3)).</li> <li>9. <input type="checkbox"/> An oath or declaration of the inventor(s) (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(4)).</li> <li>10. <input type="checkbox"/> An English language translation of the annexes of the International Preliminary Examination Report under PCT Article 36 (35 U.S.C. 371(c)(5)).</li> </ol> <p><b>Items 11 to 20 below concern document(s) or information included:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. <input type="checkbox"/> An Information Disclosure Statement under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.</li> <li>12. <input type="checkbox"/> An assignment document for recording. A separate cover sheet in compliance with 37 CFR 3.28 and 3.31 is included.</li> <li>13. <input type="checkbox"/> A FIRST preliminary amendment.</li> <li>14. <input type="checkbox"/> A SECOND or SUBSEQUENT preliminary amendment</li> <li>15. <input type="checkbox"/> A substitute specification.</li> <li>16. <input type="checkbox"/> A change of power of attorney and/or address letter.</li> <li>17. <input type="checkbox"/> A computer-readable form of the sequence listing in accordance with PCT Rule 13ter.2 and 35 U.S.C. 1.821-1.825.</li> <li>18. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A second copy of the published international application under 35 U.S.C. 154(d)(4). (<b>WO 01/25823 A1</b>)</li> <li>19. <input type="checkbox"/> A second copy of the English language translation of the international application under 35 U.S.C. 154(d)(4).</li> <li>20. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other items or information:  <b>- Form PCT/IB/308 Notice Informing the Applicant of the Communication of the International Application to the Designated Offices</b> </li> </ol>		

U.S. APPLICATION NO. (if known, see 37 CFR 1.5) <b>10/088725</b>		INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION NO. <b>PCT/GB00/03704</b>		ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NUMBER <b>US57.0359-WO</b>	
21. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The following fees are submitted: <b>BASIC NATIONAL FEE (37 CFR 1.492 (a) (1) - (5)):</b> Neither international preliminary examination fee (37 CFR 1.482) nor international search fee (37 CFR 1.445(a)(2)) paid to USPTO and International Search Report not prepared by the EPO or JPO ..... <b>\$1040.00</b>  International preliminary examination fee (37 CFR 1.482) not paid to USPTO but International Search Report prepared by the EPO or JPO..... <b>\$890.00</b>  International preliminary examination fee (37 CFR 1.482) not paid to USPTO but international search fee (37 CFR 1.445(a)(2)) paid to USPTO ..... <b>\$740.00</b>  International preliminary examination fee (37 CFR 1.482) paid to USPTO but all claims did not satisfy provisions of PCT Article 33(1)-(4)..... <b>\$710.00</b>  International preliminary examination fee (37 CFR 1.482) paid to USPTO and all claims satisfied provisions of PCT Article 33(1)-(4)..... <b>\$100.00</b>  <b>ENTER APPROPRIATE BASIC FEE AMOUNT =</b>				<b>CALCULATIONS PTO USE ONLY</b>	
Surcharge of <b>\$130.00</b> for furnishing the oath or declaration later than <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 30 months from the earliest claimed priority date (37 CFR 1.492(e)).				\$890.00	
				\$130.00	
CLAIMS	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA	RATE		
Total claims	21 - 20 =	11	x \$18.00	\$18.00	
Independent claims	3 - 3 =	0	x \$84.00	\$	
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM(S) (if applicable)			+ \$280.00	\$	
<b>TOTAL OF ABOVE CALCULATIONS =</b>				\$1038.00	
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27. The fees indicated above are reduced by 1/2.				\$	
<b>SUBTOTAL =</b>				\$	
Processing fee of <b>\$130.00</b> for furnishing the English translation later than <input type="checkbox"/> 20 <input type="checkbox"/> 30 months from the earliest claimed priority date (37 CFR 1.492(f)).				\$	
<b>TOTAL NATIONAL FEE =</b>				\$1038.00	
Fee for recording the enclosed assignment (37 CFR 1.21(h)). The assignment must be accompanied by an appropriate cover sheet (37 CFR 3.28, 3.31). <b>\$40.00</b> per property +				\$	
<b>TOTAL FEES ENCLOSED =</b>				\$	
				<b>Amount to be refunded:</b>	\$
				<b>charged</b>	<b>\$1038.00</b>
a. <input type="checkbox"/> A check in the amount of \$_____ to cover the above fees is enclosed.					
b. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please charge my Deposit Account No. <b>19-0615</b> in the amount of <b>\$1038.00</b> to cover the above fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
c. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. <b>19-0615</b> . A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.					
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Fees are to be charged to a credit card. <b>WARNING:</b> Information on this form may become public. <b>Credit card information should not be included on this form.</b> Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.					
<b>NOTE: Where an appropriate time limit under 37 CFR 1.494 or 1.495 has not been met, a petition to revive (37 CFR 1.137 (a) or (b)) must be filed and granted to restore the application to pending status.</b>					
SEND ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  Intellectual Property Law Department Schlumberger Doll Research 36 Old Quarry Road Ridgefield, CT 06877-4108				 SIGNATURE  William B. Batzer NAME  <b>37,088</b> REGISTRATION NUMBER	



10/p1/b

Method for Updating an Earth Model Using  
Measurements Gathered During Borehole Construction

FIELD OF THE INVENTION:

- 5           The present invention relates to the field of drilling oil and gas wells. In particular, the invention relates to a method for updating an earth model during construction of the well.

10 BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION:

- Earth models contain data which characterise the properties of, and surfaces bounding, the geological features which form the earth's sub-surface, such as rock formations and faults. They are used to  
15 assist operations occurring in the earth's sub-surface, such as the drilling of an oil or gas well, or the development of a mine.

- The domain of applicability of an earth model varies greatly and should be considered on a case by  
20 case basis. Some earth models are applicable only in the near vicinity of a particular oil or gas well, or mine. Others may be valid for an entire oil or gas field, or perhaps even over a region such as the North Sea or Gulf of Mexico.

- 25           The data in an earth model consists of measurements gathered during activities such as the seismic, logging or drilling operations of the oil and gas industry, and of interpretations made from these measurements. The data may be gathered above, on, or  
30 below the earth's surface.

As the duration or number of sub-surface operations increases, more data is gathered. This data can be used to amend the relevant earth model, with the aim that it should characterise the geology and  
5 properties ever more accurately. Clearly, it will be conducive to the efficiency of these operations if amendments which enhance the accuracy of the earth model are made as quickly as possible, or appropriate.

The oil and gas industry's traditional  
10 approach to amending earth models has not had a real-time element, apart from using formation integrity, leak-off or extended leak-off tests, or equivalent circulating density (ECD) data in the case of drilling fluid (commonly referred to as "mud") loss while  
15 drilling, to constrain the minimum principal in-situ stress. See e.g., Addis et al., 'A comparison of leak-off test and extended leak-off test data for stress estimation', paper SPE/ISRM 47235 presented at the 1998 Eurock Rock Mechanics in Petroleum Engineering  
20 Conference, Trondheim, July 8-10 (hereinafter "Addis et al., 1998"). Measurement-while drilling (MWD) data, logging-while drilling (LWD) data, wireline logs, results from tests performed on core, drilling  
25 amend the relevant earth model using techniques identical to those used to generate the original version of the earth model. An example of these conventional techniques are described in a publication by Schlumberger Educational Services entitled 'Log  
30 interpretation principles/applications', Houston, Texas

(1987), incorporated herein by reference and hereinafter referred to as "(Schlumberger, 1987)".

This traditional approach has been enhanced in order to improve the handling of very severe  
5 wellbore instability problems in the Cusiana field in Colombia. See, Last, N., Plumb, R.A., Harkness, R., Charlez, P., Alsen, J. and McLean, M.: 'An integrated approach to evaluating and managing wellbore  
10 instability in the Cusiana field, Colombia, South America', paper SPE 30464 presented at the 1995 Annual SPE Technical Conference, Dallas Oct. 22-25, incorporated herein by reference and hereinafter "Last et al. (1995)." Last describes an integrated approach to evaluating and managing wellbore instability. An  
15 earth model was constructed using data from existing wells, together with results obtained using a computational analysis tool which modelled the geological structure and the in-situ stress state. This allowed the upper and lower bounds to the drilling  
20 fluid density to be estimated, provided that the well trajectory was specified, using standard techniques.

As a well was drilled, a data acquisition programme which included cavings monitoring and measurements-while-drilling allowed the failure  
25 mechanisms of the rock formations to be characterised and as well as the identification and implementation of appropriate drilling practices. This led to faster, more efficient, well construction. The earth model was updated after a well or hole section had been completed  
30 using all available data, particularly (a) downhole images of borehole geometry, fractures, faults and

bedding, (b) stress measurements such as extended leak-off tests, (c) results from tests made on core, and (d) four-arm calliper logs, where available. Measurement-while-drilling techniques were used to characterise  
5 time-dependent hole geometry in particular hole intervals.

The approach of Last *et al.* (1995) enhanced the analysis of formation instability that can be made while drilling, with the minimum horizontal stress also  
10 being updated in real-time. The understanding of the nature of the formation instability led to improved drilling practices allowing the wells they studied to be constructed much more efficiently.

However, the approach of Last *et al.* (1995)  
15 has many limitations, including the following. First, no constitutive parameter or component of the in-situ stress state, other than the minimum principal stress, was updated in real-time. Such parameters were updated after drilling had been completed, using measurements  
20 made by wireline tools, in addition to the data gathered in real-time. Second, LWD measurements, such as resistivity and sonic, were not extensively used. This inhibited the diagnosis of the instability mechanisms. Due to these limitations, it was not  
25 possible to quantify amendments to drilling practices, apart from updating the value of ECD above which drilling fluid is lost to the formation.

#### SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION:

30 Thus, it is an object of the present invention to provide a method to increase the

efficiency with which an oil or gas well can be constructed.

It is a further object of the present invention to provide a method in which amendments that  
5 enhance the accuracy of the earth model are made quickly and efficiently.

It is a further object of the present invention where one or more inconsistencies are identified to provide a method of selecting which  
10 component or components of an earth model to update.

According to the present invention the efficiency with which an oil or gas well is constructed can be enhanced by updating the relevant earth model using real-time measurements of the effective density  
15 of the drilling fluid and at least one other parameter. Updating the earth model need not occur on a continuous basis, but on a timescale appropriate to this construction process. As used herein the term "real-time" is defined to mean as the well or borehole is  
20 being constructed. That is, the data acquisition can occur continuously (e.g. measurement while drilling data), or at discrete times (e.g. palaeontological analysis of rock carried by the drilling fluid from the wellbore) and still be considered "real-time".

25 A method for updating an earth model is provided that includes obtaining an earth model used for predicting potential problems in drilling of a borehole having a predetermined trajectory. Evaluations of the state of the borehole and local  
30 geological features are obtained which are based on the earth model. Data is received that has been gathered



during the construction of the borehole. The evaluations are compared with a diagnosis of the state of the borehole and local geological features to identify at least one inconsistency. A component of the earth model is identified that is both related to  
5 the identified inconsistency and has a high degree of uncertainty. The selected component of the earth model is then updated prior to completing construction of the borehole using the received data.

10 Preferably, the evaluations of the state of the borehole and local geological features are predictions of one or more conditions under which the borehole will fail, and they are obtained by combining the earth model with the predetermined trajectory of  
15 the borehole.

Preferably, the process is repeated until a sufficient match exists between the predicted failure conditions and the diagnoses of the borehole.

Preferably, the earth model component that  
20 will be updated is selected by first identifying components of the earth model that are relevant to the identified inconsistency and then ranking the identified components according to the degree of uncertainty. The component selected is preferably  
25 updated using the minimum changes needed to eliminate an identified inconsistency.

Preferably, the received data includes the effective density of the drilling fluid used in the construction of the borehole and one at least other  
30 parameter, and the selected component is updated by

using the effective density and at least one other parameter.

The invention is also embodied in a method for drilling a borehole using an earth model that is updated according to the invention. The invention is also embodied in a computer readable medium that is capable of causing a computer to update the earth model according to the invention.

10

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS:

Figure 1 illustrates the construction of a borehole according to a preferred embodiment of the invention;

Figure 2 shows a flow chart of a method of updating an earth model, according to a preferred embodiment of the invention;

Figures 3a and 3b show examples of angular cavings that have become detached from the wellbore wall when breakouts occur;

Figure 4 is a schematic representation of breakouts and drilling induced fractures in a vertical well embedded in an isotropic rock formation;

Figure 5 is a flow chart illustrating in greater detail the preferred method of updating the earth model according to the present invention;

Figure 6 illustrates an example of the minimum principal in-situ stress in an earth model;

Figure 7 illustrates an example of the mud window estimated prior to drilling a well;

Figure 8 illustrates an example of drilling hazards derived from an analysis of experience drilling offset wells and the well trajectory shown in Figure 9;

Figure 9 illustrates the trajectory of the well used in the examples of Figures 6-11;

Figure 10 illustrates the in-situ stress state prior to drilling the well used in Figures 6-11; and

Figure 11 illustrates an example of the formation strength in the example of figure 6-11.

#### DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION:

15

The present invention advantageously increases efficiency with which an oil or gas well is constructed by updating the relevant earth model using real-time measurements. Preferably, the real-time measurements are ECD and at least one other parameter, which can gathered using common commercially available methods. For example, the ECD data may be obtained using such as Schlumberger's Annular Pressure While Drilling APWD measurements. See e.g., Schlumberger Oilfield Review: 'Using Downhole Annular Pressure Measurements to Improve Drilling Performance', Sugar-Land, Texas, Winter 1998 incorporated herein by reference and hereinafter referred to as "Schlumberger (1998)".

30

Figure 1 illustrates the construction of a borehole according to a preferred embodiment of the

invention. Borehole 102 is being drilled into Earth 100. Rig 104 is located at the surface and is used to support the drilling operation. Drill bit 110 is located at the bottom of the borehole and is connected to the rig via drill string 106. Also shown is a LWD or MWD tool 108 that is capable of making measurements during the drilling operation. The dashed line 114 shows the planned borehole trajectory. Offset well 116 is also shown, along with rig 118. Although in the example of Figure 1 the boreholes are shown being drilled on land, the invention is also applicable to offshore drilling operations. Control station 112 is shown schematically, and contains one or more computers that are used to store the earth model, receive measurements from the downhole tools, and update the earth model according to the preferred embodiments described herein. The control station 112 is shown to be located near the rig 104, however in general the control station can be located remotely. Alternatively, some portions of the control station could be located remotely while other portions are located near to the borehole.

Figure 2 shows a flow chart of a method of updating an earth model, according to a preferred embodiment of the invention. In step 120, prior to drilling a well and applying the invention, an earth model is generated with seismic, logging and offset well data using techniques which are publicly documented (See, e.g., Last et al. (1995), Schlumberger, 1987). The data contained in the earth model is defined herein as the "components" of the

earth model. The types of data or components contained in an earth model typically consists of: (1) Surfaces bounding geological features, (2) Constitutive parameters of the rock. These describe the mechanical response of rock under load, (3) Stress state and pore pressure, (4) Nature and severity of the drilling hazards associated with each geological feature and/or trajectory. The drilling hazards are categorised from a list which includes hole cleaning, sloughing, chemical activity, undergauge hole, interbedded sequences, faults, naturally fractured formations, formations with weak planes, mobile formations and permeable formations (this list is not exhaustive and further categories can be envisaged), and (5) Any other parameter that may prove to be useful for real-time analysis, such as gamma-ray measurements which characterise the radioactive nature of a formation.

In step 122, the earth model is combined with the planned well trajectory 124, in order to estimate the upper and lower bounds to the drilling fluid density, together with the drilling hazards and their severity at discrete points along the trajectory. Step 122 may be accomplished using standard techniques, such as those outlined in Fjaer, E., Holt, R.M., Horsrud, P., Raaen, A.M., and Risnes, R.: 'Petroleum Related Rock Mechanics', Elsevier, Amsterdam (1992), incorporated herein by reference and hereinafter referred to as "Fjaer et al. (1992)." More sophisticated analyses could also be used which may involve concepts such as elastoplastic modelling. See e.g. Bradford, I.D.R., Fuller, J.A., Thompson, P.J.,

and Walsgrove, T.R.: 'Benefits of assessing the solids production risk in a North Sea reservoir using elastoplastic modelling', paper SPE/ISRM 47360 presented at the 1998 Eurock Rock Mechanics in  
5 Petroleum Engineering Conference, Trondheim, July 8-10 Incorporated herein by reference and hereinafter referred to as "Bradford et al., (1998)." Although the earth model is shown to be generated in step 120 and the estimations performed in step 122, the earth model  
10 and the estimates could be obtained through other means such as receiving them from an outside service provider.

As the well is being drilled, the nature and severity of instability mechanisms, together with the  
15 conditions under which they occur, are identified, or diagnosed, in step 128. The extent of any instability, which is defined as the length of wellbore over which formation failure is occurring, may also determined. The diagnosis of step 128 can be carried out by the  
20 method disclosed in Last et al. (1995). However, a more extensive use of real-time MWD and LWD measurements is preferably used for the diagnosis.

According to a preferred embodiment, in step 128, diagnosing the nature, severity and extent of  
25 wellbore instability mechanisms should include the following considerations.

1. There should be sufficient familiarity, prior to commencing operations, with the upper and lower bounds of the drilling fluid density (these  
30 define the "mud window") and the anticipated severity of any instabilities.

2. The mud density and ECD should be monitored continuously, particularly in relation to the mud window calculations in order to assess the likely degree of breakouts and the possibility of mud losses.

5 When the mud is stationary, as is the case during connections, the ECD equals the mud density. During drilling, or while circulating off bottom, the ECD typically exceeds the mud density by up to 0.5-1.0 lb/gal. During trips, when equipment is being pulled up

10 and down the well, the ECD below the bit is typically 0-0.5 lb/gal less and more, respectively, than the mud density.

3. The behaviour of the drillpipe and bottom hole assembly (BHA), hole cleaning, rate of penetration

15 (ROP), trajectory, cavings rate and morphology, mud losses/gains and chemistry, together with resistivity, gamma-ray, compressional slowness and caliper LWD measurements should also be continuously monitored. It is then possible to conduct the following evaluations:

20 (a) Cavings analysis can provide a signal that the borehole is failing and indicates the troublesome formations. Tabular, angular or splintered cavings indicate that the nature of the instability is natural fracturing or weak planes, breakouts and over-

25 pressure, respectively. The cavings rate indicates the level of failure. However, if the hole cleaning is inadequate, not all of the debris generated by any instability may be discharged from the well, thereby masking the severity of the problem. This issue is

30 discussed fully below.

(b) Mud losses occur in naturally fractured zones, faults or drilling induced fractures. Such an event indicates that the fluid pressure in the annulus has exceeded the minimum in-situ principal stress. Mud gains indicate the pore pressure has exceeded the mud pressure or that previously lost mud is being returned to the wellbore due to fracture closure. Such an event allows the pore pressure estimate to be refined. In areas where there is chemical instability, a more comprehensive mud analysis programme may be required.

(c) Gamma-ray data enables formation boundaries to be identified. Some characterisation of the formation may also be possible, if the data is combined with other measurements such as resistivity.

(d) Resistivity measurements allows fracture identification. Schlumberger's LWD tool measures the resistivity at various depths (See e.g., Schlumberger (1998)); the degree of oil based mud invasion into water filled fractures can therefore be determined.

(e) Compressional slowness characterises pore pressure and formation strength.

(f) Caliper measurements of hole enlargement, if available, will identify the unstable formations.

(g) The ROP and hole cleaning efficiency form the key links between wellbore instability and operations. Rock debris in the annulus, resulting from drilling and/or wall failure, will increase if hole cleaning is inadequate, raising the risk of pack-offs, stuck pipe and tools lost in hole. For an explanation of these terms, see Bourgoyne, A.T., Chenevert, M.E.,



Millheim, K.K. and Young, F.S.: 'Applied Drilling Engineering, SPE Textbook Series, Vol. 2 (1991), incorporated herein by reference. The ability to clean the hole is also related to the ROP. At sufficiently high ROP's, the rate of influx of debris into the annulus, from drilling and newly exposed rock which may be failing, will exceed the rate at which material can be discharged from the well, leading to the consequences outlined above.

A reliable diagnosis of the instability mechanism preferably uses all available data. If tabular cavings, due to natural fracturing, are observed, then the resistivity log should be checked for evidence of mud invasion into fractures and the mud records require examining for losses. Similarly, if splintered cavings due to over-pressured formations are seen then high gas levels, kicks or mud gains may also be present. The observation of angular cavings due to breakouts requires the debris levels in the hole to be discerned. In all cases, the cavings volume should be compared to the ECD and the degrees of tight hole and restricted circulation to discern the effectiveness of the hole cleaning and the severity of instability.

In step 130, the states of the wellbore, and geological features adjacent to it, that are predicted using the earth model are compared with those diagnosed using real-time data. If differences exist between the predicted and diagnosed states then the earth model is updated. The comparison of the estimated conditions and the real time based diagnosis should be considered to "match" when the two conditions are within a

reasonable range. For example, according to a preferred embodiment, if the mud pressure at which moderately severe breakouts occurred is not within 2 percent of the value estimated in step 122, then they  
5 considered inconsistent and a "sufficient match" in step 132 does not exist. However, the individual thresholds for each compared condition will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis.

According to a preferred embodiment, real-  
10 time data 126 includes measurements of the ECD and at least one other parameter. Preferably, these measurements are used in the comparison of diagnosed states with predictions derived from the earth model in step 130, and in the updating of the earth model, which  
15 discussed more fully below.

For example, in a vertical well, suppose the ECD exceeds the estimated lower bound of the drilling fluid density and that a steady stream of cavings is being carried from the hole. If the cavings have an  
20 angular morphology, then breakouts have occurred, albeit at a higher than expected drilling fluid pressure, as indicated by the ECD data. As the pressure of the drilling fluid decreases, zones of shear failure develop that are centred about the line  
25 of action of the minimum horizontal in-situ stress. The material in these zones eventually drops into the wellbore, leading to the cavings shown in Figures 3a and 3b. Conversely, as the drilling fluid pressure increases, fractures develop centred about the line of  
30 action of the maximum horizontal in-situ stress.

According to a preferred embodiment, following are four examples of situations in which there would be an insufficient match in step 132 and the earth model would therefore be updated:

- 5           1. Breakouts occur, or the fluid is lost to the formation, at values of ECD that differ from those that are predicted;
2. The nature, severity or extent of the drilling hazards differ from their prognosis;
- 10          3. Geological characteristics (e.g. the location of formation tops with respect to the trajectory) differ from their prognoses; or
4. Fluid or gas unexpectedly enters the wellbore indicating that estimates of the pore pressure
- 15          are inaccurate.

Referring again to Figure 2, in this example a sufficient match would not exist in step 132. Accordingly, the earth model would be updated in step 136. In this example, the in-situ stress state, the

20          formation strength, or both of these quantities should be amended so that the predicted and actual states match adequately.

According to a preferred embodiment, the components of the earth model that are the most

25          uncertain should be given priority in the updating process. This advantageously allows for the most efficient and accurate updating of the earth model. Figure 5 is a flow chart illustrating in greater detail the preferred method of updating the earth model

30          according to the present invention. Steps 150, 152 and 154 correspond to step 136 in Figure 2, whereas steps

122, 130, 132 and 134 correspond to the same steps in both figures 2 and 5.

In step 150 the components that are relevant to the inconsistency are determined. In cases where  
5 there are more than one inconsistency is identified in the comparison step 130, the most hazardous inconsistency is generally addressed first. In step 152 the relevant components identified in step 150 are ranked according to certainty. In other words, the  
10 earth model components that are most unreliable are identified, and preferably, ranked in order of reliability. Alternatively, step 150 can be skipped and the ranking step 152 applied to all or some predetermined number of most uncertain components. The  
15 goal of steps 150 and 152 are to identify the most unreliable or most uncertain components or parameters in the earth model so that the update can be focused on those components.

In step 154 the most uncertain components are  
20 updated. According to a preferred embodiment, the components that are updated are ideally altered by the smallest degree needed to allow matching of the predicted and measured components.

As discussed above, in steps 122, 130, 132,  
25 and 134 failure conditions are estimated, and comparison is made to determine if there is a sufficient match between the estimated conditions and the real time diagnosis. If there is a sufficient match, no further changes are made to the earth model.  
30 When a sufficient match is not found, steps 152, 154 122, 130 and 132 are repeated as shown in Figure 5.

When step 152 is being repeated, the recently amended components are preferably re-ranked as being more certain due to their recent amendment. When step 122 is being repeated, the well failure conditions are re-estimated using the updated components.

Following is an example the process described in Figure 5. If real-time compressional slowness data is available through use of the appropriate LWD tool, then the formation strength estimate can be inferred from this measurement and the formation strength is assumed to be the most reliable component in step 154. In step 154, the minimum change to the in-situ stress state (actually the maximum principal in-situ stress, as the minimum principal in-situ stress is constrained using a combination of fluid loss and ECD data) should then be made which allows the predicted and measured pressures at which breakouts occur to adequately match, with the latter determined using ECD data. If real-time compressional slowness data is not available, then it is assumed that the formation strength is the most unreliable (or least certain) parameter or component in step 152. In step 154, the formation strength is updated until prediction and reality match adequately.

Following are further examples of how the earth model updating processes in steps 150, 152 and 154 could be carried out, according to the invention. In particular, if breakouts or fluid losses do not occur as anticipated then the in-situ stress state and formation strength predictions should be amended. More specific examples are as follows.

Suppose the ECD exceeds the anticipated minimum principal in-situ stress without fluid loss. The minimum principal in-situ stress should be amended to be equal to the maximum ECD encountered over the appropriate interval. The new estimate of the minimum principal in-situ stress will be a lower bound to the true value, but will be more accurate than the existing prediction.

Suppose fluid loss occurs at an ECD lower than the minimum principal in-situ stress. The minimum principal in-situ stress should be set to the ECD at which the fluid loss occurred. This will require a comparison of the time based ECD and drilling fluid volume logs.

Suppose breakouts occur at a value of the ECD higher than the minimum value predicted; it is then either in-situ stress state, the formation strength, or both of these quantities that should be amended. If the formation strength can be inferred from real-time measurements, such as compressional slowness data from the appropriate LWD tool or indentation tests on cuttings, then it may be assumed to be the most reliable parameter. The minimum change to the in-situ stress state (actually the maximum principal in-situ stress, as the minimum principal in-situ stress is constrained through fluid loss observations) is then made which allows prediction to match reality. If the formation strength cannot be inferred from real-time measurements, it should be assumed to be the most unreliable parameter and then amended until there is an adequate match between prediction and reality. The

method of updating the in-situ stress or formation strength is identical in both cases: it requires that these parameters are amended until the output of the models that has used to estimate the bounds to the  
5 drilling fluid density agrees with the real-time measurement. This is an iterative process.

Breakouts occurring at values of ECD that are lower than the predicted minimum values are expected. No change is therefore made to the mechanical earth  
10 model.

Suppose the nature, severity or extent of the drilling hazards, or geological characteristics, differ from their prognoses, or fluid or gas unexpectedly enters the wellbore. The diagnostic techniques outlined  
15 in above could be used to detect these events and the earth model could then be directly updated without further computation, although the ECD should be used to assess the severity of the drilling hazard and the expectation of fluid or gas entry into the wellbore.  
20 Other real-time information, such as palaeontological analysis of cavings or LWD resistivity data, should be used to assess the extent of any instability associated with the wellbore or adjacent geology.

The following example further illustrates how  
25 an earth model may be updated. After a well had been drilled to a depth of 2000m TVD (true vertical depth), it was decided to pull the drilling equipment out of the well. However, during this process 12 barrels of drilling fluid were lost to the formation. The real-  
30 time ECD measurement showed that this occurred at a pressure equivalent to 15.35 lb/gal. Figure 6

illustrates an example of the minimum principal in-situ stress in an earth model, according to a preferred embodiment of the invention. As shown in Figure 6, the minimum principal in-situ stress was therefore revised  
5 to be the equivalent of 15.35 lb/gal for the entire region above 2000m TVD.

As discussed, estimates along the trajectory of the upper and lower bounds of the drilling fluid density, together with the nature, severity and extent  
10 of the drilling hazards, allow the states of the wellbore, and geological features adjacent to it, to be predicted while the well is constructed. Examples of these are shown in Figures 7 and 8 for a well drilled in the North Sea. Figure 7 illustrates an example of  
15 the mud window (i.e. allowable drilling fluid densities) estimated prior to drilling the well. Drilling with a mud (i.e. fluid) whose density falls to the left of the solid line leads to breakouts. Conversely, drilling with a mud whose density falls to  
20 the right of the thick broken line will cause fluid loss into the formation. The vertical axis denotes the length of wellbore below the drilling rig floor. Figure 8 illustrates an example of drilling hazards, derived from an analysis of experience drilling offset  
25 wells, and the well trajectory shown in Figure 9. In figure 8, the severity of the hazard is shown as a "traffic light" classification. The vertical cross hatch indicates that the symptoms of the instability are present but insignificant: no remedial action is  
30 necessary. The horizontal cross hatch indicates that remedial action should be taken because the instability



is significant and could become serious. The diagonal cross hatch indicates that the instability is likely to result in loss of the well. The problem should be avoided, otherwise immediate remedial action should be taken. Figure 9 illustrates the trajectory of the well used in the examples of Figures 6-11. The Northerly and westerly directions are annotated (N and W, respectively). The vertical scale is true vertical depth below the drilling rig floor. Figure 10 illustrates the in-situ stress state prior to drilling the well used in Figures 6-11. In Figure 10, the symbols  $\sigma_v$ ,  $\sigma_h$  and  $\sigma_H$  denote the vertical, minimum horizontal, maximum horizontal stresses, respectively and  $p_p$  is the pore pressure. TVD denotes true vertical depth with respect to the drilling rig floor. Figure 11 illustrates an example of the formation strength in the example of figure 6-11. The formation strength shown in Figure 11 is defined by the two parameters required to define the Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion. UCS and  $\phi$  denote the uniaxial compressive strength and friction angle respectively.

The upper and lower bounds to the drilling fluid density may be derived by combining a prediction of the stress state around the wellbore embedded in an isotropic, homogeneous medium using an undrained linear elastic model with a Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion (Fjaer *et al.*, 1992), or through use of other techniques. The lower bound represents the minimum ECD that is required in order to prevent breakouts. The upper limit represents the maximum ECD that is

allowable before rock at the wellbore wall fractures or  
fluid is lost to the formation. These bounds may,  
however, have different physical interpretations if  
more sophisticated models (for example, the deformation  
5 of a salt formation) are used to derive them.

While preferred embodiments of the invention  
have been described, the descriptions and examples are  
merely illustrative and are not intended to limit the  
present invention.

10

CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

- 5           1.    A method for updating an earth model  
comprising the steps of:
- obtaining an earth model used for predicting  
potential problems in drilling of a borehole  
having a predetermined trajectory, the earth model  
10       comprising a plurality of components;
- obtaining evaluations of the state of the  
borehole and local geological features, the  
evaluations being based on the earth model;
- receiving data gathered during the  
15       construction of the borehole;
- comparing the evaluations with a diagnosis of  
the state of the borehole and local geological  
features to identify at least one inconsistency,  
the diagnosis being based on the received data;
- 20       selecting a component of the earth model that  
is related to the identified inconsistency and has  
a high degree of uncertainty; and
- updating the selected component of the earth  
model prior to completing construction of the  
25       borehole using the received data.

2.    The method of claim 1 wherein the  
evaluations of the state of the borehole and local  
30       geological features include predictions of one or more  
conditions under which the borehole will fail.

3. The method of claim 2 wherein the predictions are obtained by combining the earth model with the predetermined trajectory of the borehole.

5

4. The method of claim 3 further comprising repeating the steps of combining, comparing, selecting and updating until a sufficient match exists between the predicted failure conditions and the diagnoses of the borehole.

10

5. The method of claim 4 wherein the step of combining when repeated uses the updated component of the earth model, and the step of selecting when being repeated, considers components that have been recently updated as having a lower degree of uncertainty.

15

6. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of selecting a component comprises:  
identifying components of the earth model that are relevant to the identified inconsistency;  
and  
ranking the identified components according to the degree of uncertainty.

20

25

7. The method of claim 1 wherein the selected component is the component having the highest degree of uncertainty of the components that are related to the identified inconsistency.

30

8. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of updating comprises effecting the minimum practical changes to the selected component that eliminates an identified inconsistency.

9. The method of claim 1 wherein the received data includes the effective density of the drilling fluid used in the construction of the borehole and one at least other parameter, and the step of updating comprises updating the selected component using the effective density and the at least one other parameter.

10. The method of claim 1 wherein the diagnosis of the borehole is generated by extensive use of real-time MWD and LWD measurements.

11. The method of claim 1 wherein the step of obtaining an earth model includes generating the earth model.

12. A method for drilling a borehole using an earth model comprising the steps of:  
obtaining an earth model used for predicting potential problems in drilling of a borehole having a predetermined trajectory comprising a plurality of components;

predicting one or more conditions under which the borehole will fail based on the earth model and the predetermined trajectory;

drilling part of the borehole substantially  
according to the predetermined trajectory;

receiving data gathered during the  
construction of the borehole;

5            comparing the predicted failure conditions  
with a diagnoses of the borehole based on the  
received data to identify at least one  
inconsistency;

10           selecting a component of the earth model that  
is related to the identified inconsistency and has  
a high degree of uncertainty;

updating the selected component of the earth  
model prior to completion of the borehole using  
the received data; and

15           thereafter drilling a further portion of the  
borehole using the earth model including the  
updated component.

13. The method of claim 12 further  
20   comprising repeating the steps of predicting,  
comparing, selecting and updating until a sufficient  
match exists between the predicted failure conditions  
and the diagnoses of the borehole.

25           14. The method of claim 13 wherein the step  
of combining when repeated uses the updated component  
of the earth model, and the step of selecting when  
being repeated, considers components that have been  
recently updated as having a lower degree of  
30   uncertainty.

15. The method of claim 12 wherein the step  
of selecting a component comprises:

identifying components of the earth model  
that are relevant to the identified inconsistency;

5 and

ranking the identified components according  
to the degree of uncertainty.

16. The method of claim 12 wherein the step  
10 of updating comprises effecting the minimum practical  
changes to the selected component that eliminates an  
identified inconsistency.

17. The method of claim 12 wherein the  
15 received data includes the effective density of the  
drilling fluid used in the construction of the borehole  
and one at least other parameter, and the step of  
updating comprises updating the selected component  
using the effective density and the at least one other  
20 parameter.

18. A computer readable medium that is  
capable of causing a computer to perform steps  
comprising:

25 obtaining an earth model used for predicting  
potential problems in drilling of a borehole  
having a predetermined trajectory, the earth model  
comprising a number of components;

obtaining evaluations of the state of the  
30 borehole and local geological features, the  
evaluations being based on the earth model;

receiving data gathered during the  
construction of the borehole;

5       comparing the evaluations with a diagnosis of  
the state of the borehole and local geological  
features to identify at least one inconsistency,  
the diagnosis being based on the received data;

      selecting a component of the earth model that  
is related to the identified inconsistency and has  
a high degree of uncertainty; and

10       updating the selected component of the earth  
model prior to completing construction of the  
borehole using the received data.

19. The computer readable medium of claim 18  
15 capable of causing a computer to perform steps further  
comprising:

      identifying components of the earth model  
that are relevant to the identified inconsistency;  
and

20       ranking the identified components according  
to the degree of uncertainty.

20. The computer readable medium of claim 19  
wherein the step of updating comprises effecting the  
25 minimum practical changes to the selected component  
that eliminates an identified inconsistency.

21. The computer readable medium of claim 20  
wherein the received data includes the effective  
30 density of the drilling fluid used in the construction  
of the borehole and one at least other parameter, and



WO 01/25823

PCT/GB00/03704

the step of updating comprises updating the selected component using the effective density and the at least one other parameter.

5

(12) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization  
International Bureau



(43) International Publication Date  
12 April 2001 (12.04.2001)


PCT

(10) International Publication Number  
**WO 01/25823 A1**

- (51) International Patent Classification?: **G01V 11/00**
- (21) International Application Number: **PCT/GB00/03704**
- (22) International Filing Date:  
27 September 2000 (27.09.2000)
- (25) Filing Language: English
- (26) Publication Language: English
- (30) Priority Data:  
9923290.2 1 October 1999 (01.10.1999) GB
- (71) Applicant (for all designated States except CA, FR, MX, US): **SCHLUMBERGER HOLDINGS LIMITED** [—/—]; Craigmuir Chambers, Road Town, P.O. Box 71, Tortola (VG).
- (71) Applicant (for CA only): **SCHLUMBERGER CANADA LIMITED** [CA/CA]; Monenco Place, 24th Floor, 801 6th Avenue, S.W., Calgary, Alberta T2P 3W2 (CA).
- (71) Applicant (for FR only): **SERVICES PETROLIERS SCHLUMBERGER** [FR/FR]; 42, rue Saint Dominique, F-75007 Paris (FR).
- (71) Applicant (for MX only): **SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY B.V.** [NL/NL]; Parkstraat 83-89, NL-2514 JG The Hague (NL).
- (72) Inventors; and
- (75) Inventors/Applicants (for US only): **BRADFORD, Ian** [GB/GB]; 66 Caribou Way, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 9XG (GB). **COOK, John, Mervyn** [GB/GB]; 4 Girtton Road, Cambridge CB3 0LJ (GB). **FULLER, John** [GB/GB]; School House, Bentley, Farnham, Surrey GU10 5JP (GB). **ALDRED, Walter, David**

[Continued on next page]

(54) Title: METHOD FOR UPDATING AN EARTH MODEL USING MEASUREMENTS GATHERED DURING BOREHOLE CONSTRUCTION



(57) Abstract: A method and system for real time updating of an earth model are disclosed. The efficiency with which an oil or gas well is constructed can be enhanced by updating the relevant earth model using real-time measurements of the effective density of the drilling fluid and other parameters. The disclosed method includes generating an earth model used for predicting potential problems in drilling of a borehole having a predetermined trajectory. Evaluations of the state of the borehole and local geological features are obtained which are based on the earth model. Real time data is used to create a diagnosis of the state of the borehole and local geological features. The evaluations are compared with a diagnosis to identify inconsistencies. A component of the earth model is identified that is both related to the identified inconsistency and has a high degree of uncertainty. The selected component of the earth model is then updated prior to completing construction of the borehole using the received data.

WO 01/25823 A1

1/10




FIG. 1

2/10




FIG. 2

WO 01/25823

PCT/GB00/03704

3/10




FIG. 3a




FIG. 3b

4/10




FIG. 4

5/10




FIG. 5

6/10




FIG. 6



WO 01/25823

PCT/GB00/03704

7/10




FIG. 7

WO 01/25823

PCT/GB00/03704

8/10




FIG. 8




FIG. 9

9/10




FIG. 10

10/10




FIG. 11

**DECLARATION FOR PATENT APPLICATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY**

As a below named inventor, I/We hereby declare that:

My/Our residence, post office address(s) and citizenship(s) are as stated below next to my/our name(s), and

I/We believe I/We am/are the original, first and sole inventor of the subject matter which is claimed (if only one name is listed below) or an original and first inventor of at least some of the subject matter which is claimed (if plural names are listed below) and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled

**METHOD FOR UPDATING AN EARTH MODEL USING MEASUREMENTS  
GATHERED DURING BOREHOLE CONSTRUCTION**

the specification of which

☐ is attached hereto.

☒ was filed on **27 September 2000**

as PCT International Application No. **PCT/GB00/03704**

and was amended on \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable).

I/We hereby state that I/we have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I/We acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56(a).

**Prior Foreign Application(s)**

I/We hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, Section 119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate listed below and have also identified below any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:

Country	Application No.	Filed (d/m/y) (01.10.99)	Issued (d/m/y)	Priority Claimed
Great Britain	9923290.2	01 October 1999		Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
				Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

**Prior United States Applications**

I/We hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, Section 120 of any United States application(s) listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, Section 112, I/We acknowledge the duty to disclose material information as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1.56(a) which occurred between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

Application Serial No.	Filing Date (d/m/y)	Status (Patented, Pending, Abandoned)

And, I/We hereby appoint, both jointly and severally, as my attorney(s) and/or agent(s) with full power of substitution and revocation, to prosecute this application and to transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected herewith the following attorney(s) and agent(s), their registration numbers being listed after their names.

John J. Ryberg, 31,134; William B. Batzer, 37,088; William L. Wang, 39,871; and Jody Lynn DeStefanis, 44,653

I/We hereby request that all correspondence be directed to:

Intellectual Property Law Department,  
Schlumberger-Doll Research,  
36 Old Quarry Rd., Ridgefield, CT 06877,

and that all telephone calls be directed to Patent Department at (203) 431-5507.

I hereby declare (if sole inventor) or each of us hereby declares (if joint inventors) that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

**SOLE OR FIRST INVENTOR**

Signature: I. D. R. Bradford Date: 10<sup>th</sup> April 2002

Full Name: Ian BRADFORD

Residence: 66 Caribou Way, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 9XG, Great Britain

Citizenship: Great Britain

Post Office Address: 66 Caribou Way, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge, Cambridgeshire CB1 9XG, Great Britain

**SECOND INVENTOR**

SECOND INVENTOR JM Cook  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 15<sup>th</sup> April 2002

Full Name: John Mervyn **COOK**

Residence: 4 Girton Road, Cambridge CB3 0LJ, Great Britain

Citizenship: Great Britain

Post Office Address: 4 Girton Road, Cambridge CB3 0LJ, Great Britain

**THIRD INVENTOR**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 8<sup>th</sup> April 2002

Full Name: John FULLER

Residence: School House, Bentley, Farnham, Surrey GU10 5JP, Great Britain

Citizenship: Great Britain

Post Office Address: School House, Bentley, Farnham, Surrey GU10 5JP, Great Britain

**FOURTH INVENTOR**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 29<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2002

Full Name: Walter David ALDRED

Residence: 11515 Rock Bend Drive, Houston, Texas 77077

Citizenship: Great Britain

Post Office Address: 11515 Rock Bend Drive, Houston, Texas 77077

**FIFTH INVENTOR**

Signature: V. A. Gholkar Date: 28 March 2002

Full Name: Vidhyadhar GHOLKAR

Residence: 26 Holm Court, Twycross Road, Godalming GU7 2QT, Great Britain

Citizenship: Great Britain

Post Office Address: 26 Holm Court, Twycross Road, Godalming GU7 2QT, Great Britain